Complete Form of Fermion Self-energy in NJL Model with External Magnetic Field

Song Shi[1], Yi-Lun Du[1], Zhu-Fang Cui[1], Yong-Hui Xia[1], and Hong-Shi Zong[1,2*]
[1] *Department of Physics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China and*
[2] *Joint Center for Particle, Nuclear Physics and Cosmology, Nanjing 210093, China*

In this paper, we aim to study the complete form of self-energy in fermion propagator within two-flavor NJL model in the case of finite temperature, chemical potential and external magnetic field. Through self-consistency analysis we prove that the self-energy is not simply proportional to dynamical mass in the presence of chemical potential, moreover, it could be more complicated after introducing external magnetic field. We find out the appropriate and complete form of self-energy and establish new gap equations. The numerical results show that the dynamical mass only has small quantitative modification rather than qualitative change by using these new gap equations, but the new self-energy does generate split in the dispersion relation with fixed momentum and Landau level.

Key-words: NJL model, magnetic field, dynamical mass, gap equations, self-energy

PACS Numbers: 11.10.Wx, 26.60.Kp, 21.65.Qr, 25.75.Nq, 12.39.Ki

arXiv:1601.06637v1 [hep-ph] 25 Jan 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

The phase structure of QCD matter has always been an important and attractive topic in theoretical physics [1–7]. In relativistic heavy-ion collisions, the produced QCD matter will go though a phase transition or a crossover as time goes by. Either way, the state of QCD matter is believed to change from quark-gluon plasma to hadronic matter in this process. Its physical properties and dynamical behaviors such as chiral symmetry and confinement are altered along with the change of the state.

At the early stage of noncentral collision, the QCD matter produces extremely strong magnetic field [8], which brings about obvious magnetic effects. Therefore studying QCD matter's properties under the influence of magnetic field becomes a meaningful and important subject. So far, many relevant theories and models have been proposed and it is shown that the quark condensate are strengthened by magnetic field, which is known as 'Magnetic Catalysis' [9–13]. Consequently, the QCD phase diagram is related to magnetic field [14, 15].

NJL model is quite a useful and convenient tool to qualitatively study QCD matter states [1, 2, 16–23]. For a NJL model we usually apply mean field approximation to deal with the four fermion interaction terms, namely, $(\bar{\psi}\psi)^2 \to 2\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle(\bar{\psi}\psi) - \langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle^2$, $(i\bar{\psi}\gamma^5\vec{\tau}\psi)^2 \to 2\langle i\bar{\psi}\gamma^5\vec{\tau}\psi\rangle\cdot(i\bar{\psi}\gamma^5\vec{\tau}\psi) - \langle i\bar{\psi}\gamma^5\vec{\tau}\psi\rangle^2$. It is believed that this approximation is equivalent to Dyson-Schwinger equations with contact interaction treatment, hence the gap equation can be written as

$$\frac{\Sigma}{G}\int d^4x = i\int d^4x\,\langle x|\gamma^\mu\hat{S}\gamma_\mu|x\rangle, \tag{1}$$

$$\hat{S}^{-1} = \hat{S}_0^{-1} - \Sigma, \tag{2}$$

$$\Sigma = \sigma + i\gamma^5\vec{\pi}\cdot\vec{\tau}, \qquad \sigma = -\frac{G}{N_c}\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle, \qquad \vec{\pi} = -\frac{G}{N_c}\langle i\bar{\psi}\gamma^5\vec{\tau}\psi\rangle. \tag{3}$$

In the above equations, Σ represents self-energy of fermion propagator, it contains dynamical mass σ, which is generated by non-perturbative effect, more specifically, dynamical chiral symmetry breaking. Generally speaking, there is $\vec{\pi} = 0$ in Eq. (1), which leads to $\Sigma = \sigma$. Therefore it is usually more convenient to study dynamical mass directly rather than discuss a general form of self-energy. But in M. Asakawa and K. Yazaki's work [24], they have pointed that, in a self-consistent mean-field approximation, the self-energy does not simply equal dynamical mass, which reveals with the help of the Fierz transformation. When chemical potential μ is not zero, the actual self-energy

*zonghs@nju.edu.cn

should be written as $\Sigma = \sigma + a\gamma^0$ to guarantee the self-consistency of gap equation (1) . In this new Σ, we can combine a with chemical potential as a renormalized chemical potential $\mu_r = \mu - a$.

In this paper, we are about to study the self-energy problem in two flavor NJL model with temperature, chemical potential and external magnetic field, the self-energy must not simply equal dynamical mass. In order to find out the appropriate and complete self-energy, we start from the most general form, a $(4\times4)_{\rm s}\otimes(2\times2)_{\rm f}$ matrix (spinor space and flavor space), and rule out its inappropriate parts. The detail is discussed in Appendix A.

II. THE GAP EQUATIONS AND NUMERICAL RESULTS

A two-flavor NJL model Lagrangian with external magnetic field in Minkowski space is

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{\psi}(i\partial\!\!\!/ + eA\!\!\!/ \otimes Q)\psi + \frac{G}{2N_c}[(\bar{\psi}\psi)^2 + (i\bar{\psi}\gamma^5\otimes\vec{\tau}\psi)^2], \tag{4}$$

$$(A_0, A_1, A_2, A_3) = (0, \frac{B}{2}x^2, -\frac{B}{2}x^1, 0), \tag{5}$$

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} q_{\rm u} & 0 \\ 0 & q_{\rm d} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad q_{\rm u} = \frac{2}{3}, \qquad q_{\rm d} = -\frac{1}{3}, \tag{6}$$

we also define a flavor index 'f' for convenience,

$$\mathrm{f} = \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{d}, \qquad q_{\rm f} = q_{\rm u}, q_{\rm d}. \tag{7}$$

A. Gap Equations

At finite temperature T ($\beta = 1/T$),

$$\Pi_0 \to i\omega_m, \qquad \omega_m = (2m+1)\pi T, \qquad m\in\mathbb{Z}. \tag{8}$$

Through Eq. (A1) and Eq. (A3) in Appendix A, we define the renormalized chemical potential as

$$\mu_r = \mu - a. \tag{9}$$

Referring to our previous work [19], one can quantize the quadratic sum of $\hat{\Pi}_1^{\rm f}$ and $\hat{\Pi}_2^{\rm f}$, $[(\Pi_1^{\rm f})^2 + (\Pi_2^{\rm f})^2] \to (2n+1)|q_{\rm f}|eB$ ($n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$). According to [17, 26], one can transform summation of ω_m at finite chemical potential to an integral of a few hyperbolic functions.

With these preparations above, now we are able to deduce the gap equations so as to conduct further numerical calculation,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{4\pi^2}{G} =& \sum_{\rm f}\frac{|q_{\rm f}|eB}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int_0^{+\infty}\frac{\coth(|q_{\rm f}|eBs)}{\sqrt{s}}\,ds\int\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\omega_+}{\omega}e^{-\omega_+^2 s}+\frac{\omega_-}{\omega}e^{-\omega_-^2 s}\right)dp_3\\ &- eB\int\frac{1}{\omega}\left[\frac{1}{1+e^{\beta(\omega_+ +\mu_r)}}+\frac{1}{1+e^{\beta(\omega_- -\mu_r)}}\right]dp_3\\ &- \sum_{\rm f}2|q_{\rm f}|eB\int\frac{1}{\omega}\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty}(F_{+n\rm f}+F_{-n\rm f})\,dp_3 + 2eB\,\theta(|b|-\sigma)\ln\left(\frac{|b|+\sqrt{b^2-\sigma^2}}{\sigma}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{4\pi^2}{G}b =& \sum_{\rm f}\frac{|q_{\rm f}|eB}{4\sqrt{\pi}}\int_0^{+\infty}\frac{\coth(|q_{\rm f}|eBs)}{\sqrt{s}}\,ds\int(\omega_+e^{-\omega_+^2 s}-\omega_-e^{-\omega_-^2 s})\,dp_3\\ &+ \frac{eB}{2}\int\left[\frac{1}{1+e^{\beta(\omega_- -\mu_r)}}-\frac{1}{1+e^{\beta(\omega_+ +\mu_r)}}\right]dp_3\\ &+ \sum_{\rm f}|q_{\rm f}|eB\int\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty}(F_{-n\rm f}-F_{+n\rm f})\,dp_3 + eB[\theta(-b-\sigma)-\theta(b-\sigma)]\sqrt{b^2-\sigma^2},\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{4\pi^2}{G}a =&\frac{eB}{2}\int\left[\frac{1}{1+e^{\beta(\omega_- -\mu_r)}}-\frac{1}{1+e^{\beta(\omega_+ +\mu_r)}}\right]dp_3\\&+\sum_{\mathrm{f}}|q_{\mathrm{f}}|eB\int\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty}\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{1}{1+e^{\beta(\omega_{+\mathrm{nf}}-\mu_r)}}-\frac{1}{1+e^{\beta(\omega_{+\mathrm{nf}}+\mu_r)}}+\frac{1}{1+e^{\beta(\omega_{-\mathrm{nf}}-\mu_r)}}-\frac{1}{1+e^{\beta(\omega_{-\mathrm{nf}}+\mu_r)}}\right]dp_3,\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

$$\omega=\sqrt{p_3^2+\sigma^2},\quad \omega_\pm=\omega\pm b,\quad \omega_{\pm\mathrm{nf}}=\sqrt{\omega_\pm^2+2n|q_{\mathrm{f}}|eB},\quad n=1,2,3,\ldots,\quad \mathrm{f}=\mathrm{u},\mathrm{d},\tag{13}$$

$$F_{\pm nf}=\frac{\omega_\pm}{2\omega_{\pm nf}}\frac{1}{1+e^{\beta(\omega_{\pm\mathrm{nf}}-\mu_r)}}+\frac{\omega_\pm}{2\omega_{\pm nf}}\frac{1}{1+e^{\beta(\omega_{\pm\mathrm{nf}}+\mu_r)}},\quad n=1,2,3,\ldots,\quad \mathrm{f}=\mathrm{u},\mathrm{d}.\tag{14}$$

B. Regularization and Approximation

Because μ_r has replaced μ in gap equations, it is not so important to calculate the value of parameter a in Eq. (12), we can treat μ_r as a free variable and then focus on solving Eq. (10) and Eq. (11). One can also prove that when $T\to 0$, $\mu_r=0$ and $b=0$, Eq. (10) will degenerate into classic gap equation with external magnetic field

$$\frac{4\pi^2}{G}=\sum_{\mathrm{f}}|q_{\mathrm{f}}|eB\int_0^{+\infty}\frac{e^{-\sigma^2 s}}{s}\coth(|q_{\mathrm{f}}|eBs)\,ds,\tag{15}$$

which means we can apply the same regularization scheme (referring to [19, 25]) to proper time s in Eq. (10) and Eq. (11),

$$\int_0^{+\infty}ds\to\int_{1/\Lambda^2}^{+\infty}ds,\tag{16}$$

we choose

$$\Lambda=0.991\mathrm{GeV},\qquad G=25.4\mathrm{GeV}^{-2}.\tag{17}$$

Through numerical analysis, we find that when the solutions of σ are nonzero, b's values are always far smaller than σ's but nonzero neither, therefore it is reasonable to simplify Eq. (10) and Eq. (11) by Taylor expanding b to the first order. Also, we find that after substituting σ's and b's solutions back to Eq. (11), the values of $\frac{G}{4\pi^2}\sum_{\mathrm{f}}|q_{\mathrm{f}}|eB\cdot|\int\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty}(F_{-\mathrm{nf}}-F_{+nf})\,dp_3|$ are always much smaller than b's, this term contributes little to gap equations, we can safely remove this term to facilitate the numerical calculation. Now the gap equations are modified to

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{4\pi^2}{G}=&\sum_{\mathrm{f}}|q_{\mathrm{f}}|eB\int_{1/\Lambda^2}^{+\infty}\frac{e^{-\sigma^2 s}}{s}\coth(|q_{\mathrm{f}}|eBs)\,ds\\&-\sum_{\mathrm{f}}2|q_{\mathrm{f}}|eB\int\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty}\frac{1}{\omega_{\mathrm{nf}}}\left[\frac{1}{1+e^{\beta(\omega_{\mathrm{nf}}-\mu_r)}}+\frac{1}{1+e^{\beta(\omega_{\mathrm{nf}}+\mu_r)}}\right]dp_3\\&-eB\int\frac{1}{\omega}\left[\frac{1}{1+e^{\beta(\omega_+ +\mu_r)}}+\frac{1}{1+e^{\beta(\omega_- -\mu_r)}}\right]dp_3,\end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{4\pi^2}{G}b=&\sigma^2 b\sum_{\mathrm{f}}|q_{\mathrm{f}}|eB\int_{1/\Lambda^2}^{+\infty}e^{-\sigma^2 s}\coth(|q_{\mathrm{f}}|eBs)\,ds\\&+\frac{eB}{2}\int\left[\frac{1}{1+e^{\beta(\omega_- -\mu_r)}}-\frac{1}{1+e^{\beta(\omega_+ +\mu_r)}}\right]dp_3,\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

$$\omega_{\mathrm{nf}}=\sqrt{p_3^2+\sigma^2+2n|q_{\mathrm{f}}|eB},\quad n=1,2,3,\ldots,\quad \mathrm{f}=\mathrm{u},\mathrm{d}.\tag{20}$$

since the solutions of σ are always bigger than the corresponding solutions of b, the terms containing θ functions have been removed in Eq. (18) and Eq. (19).



FIG. 1: The μ dependance of dynamical mass σ with fixed temperature and different eBs, $T = 0.01$GeV.



FIG. 2: The μ dependance of dynamical mass σ with fixed temperature and different eBs, $T = 0.15$GeV.

For some specific values of T, μ and eB, Eq. (18) and Eq. (19) do not have solutions for σ and b any more, because at these points, dynamical mass σ jumps to zero (Wigner solution) and chiral phase transition happens. In these cases, gap equations degenerate into

$$\frac{4\pi^2}{G}b = eB\mu_r. \tag{21}$$

This equation is strictly deduced from Eq. (11) without approximation. The Wigner solution always exist, actually in order to deduce Eq. (10) from Eq. (A1), we cancel a common factor σ from both sides of an intermediate equation, which implies $\sigma = 0$ is always a solution. So we can say that when the Wigner solution $\sigma = 0$ is preferred, b is proportional to both renormalized chemical potential and magnetic field. Here, it should be noted that this phenomenon has not been found in the previous literatures.

C. Numerical Results

Referring to Figs. (1)-(4), the dynamical mass σ has first order phase transition when renormalized chemical potential reaches a critical point, of course this critical point depends on temperature and magnetic field. Generally speaking, the stronger magnetic field and lower temperature is, the bigger dynamical mass is generated. However in Fig. (1), when μ_r crosses a specific point, the $eB = 0.01\text{GeV}^{-1}$ line and $eB = 0.13\text{GeV}^{-1}$ line show us inverse magnetic catalysis effect, which means the stronger magnetic field is, the smaller dynamical mass is generated. We can also gain a vivid cognition from Fig. (5). For NJL model, inverse magnetic catalysis does not always exist at other temperatures, for example, in Fig. (2), $T = 0.15$GeV, catalysis effect is not inverse.

Comparing with σ-μ_r relations, the corresponding b-μ_r relations are shown in Figs. (6)-(9). From these relations, one can see that, b-μ_r and σ-μ_r relations show gaps at the same critical μ_r. After crossing these critical μ_r, b-μ_r relations are strictly linear correlative because of Eq. (21). Similar to dynamical mass, with fixed temperature, the stronger magnetic field is, the bigger value of b is, but unlike dynamical mass, with magnetic field fixed, lower temperature makes smaller value of b before μ_r reaching critical points.



FIG. 3: The μ dependance of dynamical mass σ with fixed eB and different temperatures, $eB = 0.01\text{GeV}^2$.



FIG. 4: The μ dependance of dynamical mass σ with fixed eB and different temperatures, $eB = 0.28\text{GeV}^2$.



FIG. 5: The eB dependance of dynamical mass σ with fixed temperature and different chemical potentials, $T = 0.01\text{GeV}$.



FIG. 6: The μ dependance of b with fixed temperature and different eBs, $T = 0.01\text{GeV}$.



FIG. 7: The μ dependance of b with fixed temperature and different eBs, $T = 0.15\text{GeV}$.



FIG. 8: The μ dependance of b with fixed eB and different temperatures, $eB = 0.01\text{GeV}^2$.

III. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have studied the self-energy of NJL model in the presence of temperature, chemical potential and external magnetic field, it turns out when chemical potential is nonzero, the self-energy is no longer equivalent to dynamical mass. In order to establish correct gap equations, one has to employ a full self-energy structure first, and then use some self-consistent conditions or symmetries to simplify the structure.

In the new self-energy (A3), σ still stands for dynamical mass. Similar to dynamical mass, a could be thought as dynamical chemical potential, but its existence depends on the existence of original chemical potential μ, it appears to be the modification of original chemical potential. By analyzing numerical results, we find b's values are always much smaller than σ's when σ has non-zero solutions, which implies b's existence only quantitatively modifies dynamical



FIG. 9: The μ dependance of b with fixed temperature and different temperatures, $eB = 0.28\text{GeV}^2$.

mass a little rather than qualitatively changes the properties of dynamical mass during phase transition. Therefore assuming self-energy equals dynamical mass is a reasonable approximation, and it suffices to calculate dynamical mass only. Nevertheless, after phase transition, dynamical mass becomes zero, b will be simply proportional to magnetic field and renormalized chemical potential, which brings about two meaningful results: Firstly, self-energy in Wigner phase is no longer trivial at chiral limit, although dynamical mass remains zero, a, b change along with temperature, chemical potential and magnetic field. Secondly, if chemical potential or magnetic field is large enough, b's values would bring about possible observable effects. Importantly in physics, b causes splitting of dispersion relation according to Eq. (13). Especially in Wigner phase, b is capable of acquiring bigger values, hence the dispersion relation Eq. (13) is rewritten as

$$\omega_{\pm nf} = \sqrt{(|p_3| \pm b)^2 + 2n|q_f|eB}, \tag{22}$$

apparently, at specific momentum and Landau level, one particle can have two different energies.

As shown in Eqs. (13) and (22), the physical effects induced by b depend on dispersion relation, the change of dispersion relation causes different particle number densities. In this paper, the strength of magnetic field ranges from 0.01 to 0.28GeV^2, which correspond approximately around 10^{19}-10^{20} Gauss. This is nearly the strongest magnetic field in experiments, and even so, the physical effects are still too small to be distinguished from experiments. We are looking forward to other conditions that can bring us obvious effects. Large space scale could enlarge tiny modification in dispersion relation, for example, magnestar, one kind of neutron star, which is expected to have magnetic field of 10^{15} Gauss, although this strength is much smaller than the strength we employ in this paper, magnestars have large volumes. On the other hand, we can also simply expect larger magnetic field to show obvious effects in future experiments. It is believed that in early universe, the magnetic field could reach 10^{23} Gauss, hence the results in this paper may play an important role in early universe evolution.

The inverse magnetic catalysis effect mentioned in Fig. (5) is not exactly the same as the well-known inverse magnetic catalysis studied in these articles [27, 28]. The lattice results show inverse magnetic catalysis happens at $\mu = 0$, $T \neq 0$. But in NJL model, this can not happen with mean field approximation at least. In NJL model, when chemical potential is small enough, the dynamical mass strictly obeys the rule of magnetic catalysis. We are looking forward to use other methods beyond mean field approximation to find out inverse magnetic catalysis in NJL model.

Appendix A: The Appropriate Form of Self-energy

According to Ref. [24], if one wants to apply mean field approximation to Eq. (4), only making $(\bar{\psi}\psi)$ and $(i\bar{\psi}\gamma^5 \otimes \vec{\tau}\psi)$ to be mean fields is not enough. Instead, one should make Fierz transformation firstly, this will provide us more four fermion interaction terms, and then we can apply mean field approximation to each four fermion terms. Hence we are led to a complex self-energy $\Sigma_{\rm sf}$, which should be a $(4\times4)_{\rm s}\otimes(2\times2)_{\rm f}$ matrix. Through the discussion in the Appendix B of Ref. [19], we can simplify this self-energy to $\Sigma_{\rm sf} = \Sigma \otimes I_2$, and the gap equation is simply written as

$$\frac{\Sigma}{G}\int dx = i\sum_{\rm f}\int dx\, \langle x|\gamma^\mu \hat{S}_{\rm f}\gamma_\mu|x\rangle, \tag{A1}$$

$$\hat{S}_{\rm f}{}^{-1} = \not{\Pi}^{\rm f} + \mu\gamma^0 - \Sigma, \qquad \hat{\Pi}^{\rm f}_\mu = i\partial_\mu + q_{\rm f}eA_\mu. \tag{A2}$$

Now Σ becomes a (4×4) matrix, it must be the linear combination of the sixteen matrices $\{I, \gamma^\mu, \gamma^5, \gamma^5\gamma^\mu, \sigma^{\mu\nu}\}$. From the right-hand side of Eq. (A1), we know that Σ should be a coordinate (or momentum) irrelevant matrix. Noticing $\gamma^\mu\sigma^{\nu\rho}\gamma_\mu = 0$, we are sure that Σ does not include $\sigma^{\mu\nu}$ terms. Σ does not have γ^5 and $\gamma^5\gamma^0$ terms neither because the original Lagrangian Eq. (4) does not violate parity symmetry. Since magnetic field $\vec{B}$ is parallel to x^3 axis, the Lorentz invariance is broken into SO(2) symmetry in x^1-x^2 plane, which implies that the γ^i terms $(i = 1, 2)$ should be proportional to $\Pi_i\gamma^i$, and $\gamma^5\gamma^i$ terms $(i = 1, 2)$ should be proportional to $\Pi_i\gamma^5\gamma^i$. However these requests conflict with the statement that Σ is a coordinate or momentum irrelevant matrix in the beginning. Therefore Σ does not have γ^i and $\gamma^5\gamma^i$ $(i = 1, 2)$ terms neither. As for γ^3 term, it only causes a shift to Π_3, and the integral of Π_3 makes it trivial.

On the basis of above analysis, we simplify the self-energy to an appropriate and complete form

$$\Sigma = \sigma + a\gamma^0 + b\gamma^5\gamma^3. \tag{A3}$$

Acknowledgments

This work is supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (under Grants No. 11275097, No. 11475085, and No. 11535005), the Jiangsu Planned Projects for Postdoctoral Research Funds (under Grant No. 1402006C), and the National Natural Science Foundation of Jiangsu Province of China (under Grant No. BK20130078).

[1] Kenji Fukushima, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 114028 (2008).
[2] P. Costa, C. A. de Sousa, M. C. Ruivo et al, Phys. Lett. B **647**, 431 (2007).
[3] C. Shi, Y.-L. Wang, Y. Jiang et al, JHEP **07**(2014)014.
[4] A-M. Zhao, Z.-F. Cui, Y. Jiang et al, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 114031 (2014).
[5] Y. Jiang, L.-J. Luo and H.-S. Zong, JHEP **66**(2011)1.
[6] S.-S. Xu, Z.-F. Cui, B. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **91**(5), 056003 (2015).
[7] W.-J. Fu, Z. Zhang and Y.-X. Liu, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 014006 (2008).
[8] D. E. Kharzeev, L. D. McLerran, and H. J. Warringa, Nucl. Phys. **A803**, 227 (2008).
[9] V. P. Gusynin, V. A. Miransky and I. A. Shovkovy, Phys. Lett. B **349**, 477 (1995).
[10] V. P. Gusynin, V. A. Miransky and I. A. Shovkovy, Phys. Rev. D **52**(8), 4747 (1995).
[11] D. Ebert, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 025005 (1999).
[12] I. A. Shovkovy, Lect. Notes Phys. 871, 13 (2013), also arXiv:1207.5081 [hep-ph].
[13] A. Chodos and K. Everding, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 2881 (1990).
[14] J. O. Andersen, W. R. Naylor, A. Tranberg, arXiv:1411.7176 [hep-ph].
[15] G. Endrödi, JHEP07(2015)173.
[16] S. Ghosh, S. Mandal and S. Chakrabarty, Phys. Rev. C **75**, 015805 (2007).
[17] D. P. Menezes, M. Benghi Pinto, S. S. Avancini et al, Phys. Rev. C **79**, 035807 (2009).
[18] D. P. Menezes, M. Benghi Pinto, S. S. Avancini et al, Phys. Rev. C **80**, 065805 (2009).
[19] S. Shi, Y.-C. Yang, Y.-H. Xia et al, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 036006 (2015).
[20] Y.-L. Du, Z.-F. Cui, Y.-H. Xia et al, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 114019 (2013).
[21] Z.-F. Cui, F.-Y. Hou, Y.-M. Shi et al, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **358**, 172 (2015).
[22] Y.-L. Du, Y. Lu, S.-S. Xue et al, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A. **30**, 1550199 (2015).
[23] Y. Lu, Y.-L. Du, Z.-F. Cui et al, Eur. Phys. J. C **75**(10), 1 (2015).
[24] M. Asakawa and K. Yazaki, Nucl. Phys. **A504**, 668 (1989).
[25] T. Inagaki, D. Kimura, and T. Murata, Prog. Theor. Phys. **111**, 371 (2004).
[26] J. I. Kapusta. FINITE-TEMPERATURE FIELD THEORY. Cambridge, New York, USA: Cambridge University Press, 1989: pp26-27.
[27] G. S. Bali, F. Bruckmann, G. Endrödi et at, JHEP **02**(2012)044.
[28] F. Bruckmann, G. Endrödi and T. G. Kovacs, JHEP **04**(2013)112